arXiv:1404.6196v4 [cs.LO] 20 Jun 2014

Proving Termination of Unfolding Graph Rewriting for General Safe Recursion

Naohi Eguchi*

Institute of Computer Science, University of Innsbruck
Technikerstrasse 21a, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria
naohi.eguchi@uibk.ac.at

Abstract. In this paper we present a new termination proof and complexity analysis of *unfolding graph rewriting* which is a specific kind of infinite graph rewriting expressing the general form of safe recursion. We introduce a termination order over sequences of terms together with an interpretation of term graphs into sequences of terms. Unfolding graph rewrite rules expressing general safe recursion can be successfully embedded into the termination order by the interpretation, yielding the polynomial runtime complexity. Moreover, generalising the definition of unfolding graph rewrite rules for general safe recursion, we propose a new criterion for the polynomial runtime complexity of infinite GRSs and for the polynomial size of normal forms in infinite GRSs.

1 Introduction

In this paper we present a new termination proof and complexity analysis of a specific kind of infinite graph rewriting called *unfolding graph rewriting* [8]. The formulation of unfolding graph rewriting stems from a function-algebraic characterisation of the polytime computable functions based on the principle known as *safe recursion* [7] or *tiered recursion* [10]. The schema of safe recursion is a syntactic restriction of the standard primitive recursion based on a specific separation of argument positions of functions into two kinds. Notationally, the separation is indicated by semicolon as $f(x_1, \dots, x_k\,; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{k+l})$, where $x_1, \dots, x_k$ are called *normal* arguments while $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{k+l}$ are called *safe* ones. The schema (**Safe Recursion**) formalises the idea that recursive calls is restricted on normal argument whereas substitution of recursion terms is restricted for safe arguments:

$$\begin{aligned} f(0, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{z}) &= g(\boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{z}) \\ f(c_i(x), \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{z}) &= h_i(x, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{z}, f(x, \boldsymbol{y}; \boldsymbol{z})) \qquad (i \in I), \end{aligned} \tag{**Safe Recursion**}$$

where I is a finite set of indices. The purely function-algebraic characterisation in [7] is made more flexible and polynomial runtime complexity analysis is established in [5,3] in terms of termination orders. As discussed in [8], safe recursion

* The author is supported by Grants-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows (Grant No. 25·726) that is granted at Graduate School of Science, Chiba University, Japan.

is sound for polynomial runtime complexity over unary constructor, i.e., over numerals or sequences, but it was not clear whether general forms of safe recursion over arbitrary constructors, which is called *general ramified recurrence* [8] or (**General Safe Recursion**), could be related to polytime computability.

$$f(c_i(x_1,\ldots,x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_i)}),\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{z}) = h_i(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{z},f(x_1,\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{z}),\ldots,f(x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_i)},\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{z}))\ (i\in I) \quad \text{(General Safe Recursion)}$$

To see the difficulty of this question, consider a term rewrite system (TRS for short) $\mathcal{R}$ over the constructors $\{\epsilon,\mathsf{c},\mathsf{0},\mathsf{s}\}$ consisting of the following four rules with the argument separation indicated in the rules.

$$\begin{array}{rr} \mathsf{g}(\epsilon\,;z)\to z & \mathsf{g}(\mathsf{c}(\,;x,y)\,;z)\to \mathsf{c}(\,;\mathsf{g}(x\,;z),\mathsf{g}(y\,;z)) \\ \mathsf{f}(\mathsf{0},y\,;)\to\epsilon & \mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(\,;x),y\,;)\to \mathsf{g}(y\,;\mathsf{f}(x,y\,;)) \end{array}$$

Under the natural interpretation, $\mathsf{g}(x,y)$ generates the binary tree appending the tree y to every leaf of the tree x, and $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}^m(\mathsf{0}),x)$ generates a tree consisting of exponentially many copies of the tree x measured by m. Namely, rewriting in the TRS $\mathcal{R}$ results in normal forms of exponential size measured by the size of starting terms. This problem cannot be solved by simple sharing. The authors of [8] solved this problem, showing that the equation of general safe recursion can be expressed by an infinite set of unfolding graph rewriting. As a consequence, the same authors answered the above question positively in the sense as Theorem 3.3 in Section 3. In the present work, instead of looking at unfolding graph rewriting sequences carefully, we propose complexity analysis by means of termination orders over sequences of terms (Section 4) together with a successful embedding (Section 5), sharpening the complexity result obtained in [8] (Section 6, Corollary 6.8). In Section 7 we generalise the definition of unfolding graph rewrite rules for general safe recursion, we propose a new criterion for the polynomial runtime complexity of infinite GRSs and for the polynomial size of normal forms in infinite GRSs (Corollary 7.8).

2 Term graph rewriting

In this section, we present basics of term graph rewriting following [6]. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a *signature*, a finite set of function symbols, and let $\mathsf{arity}:\mathcal{F}\to\mathbb{N}$ where $\mathsf{arity}(f)$ is called the *arity* of f. We assume that $\mathcal{F}$ be a signature partitioned into the set $\mathcal{C}$ of constructors and the set $\mathcal{D}$ of defined symbols. Let $G=(V_G,E_G)$ be a directed graph consisting of a set V_G of vertices (or nodes) and a set E_G of directed edges. A *labeled graph* is a triple $(G,\mathsf{lab}_G,\mathsf{succ}_G)$ of an acyclic directed graph $G=(V_G,E_G)$, a partial *labeling* function $\mathsf{lab}_G:V_G\to\mathcal{F}$ and a (total) *successor* function $\mathsf{succ}_G:V_G\to V_G^*$, mapping a node $v\in V_G$ to a sequence of nodes of length $\mathsf{arity}(\mathsf{lab}_G)$, such that if $\mathsf{succ}_G(v)=v_1,\ldots,v_k$, then $\{v_1,\ldots,v_k\}=\{u\in V_G\mid (v,u)\in E_G\}$. In case $\mathsf{succ}_G(v)=v_1,\ldots,v_k$, the node v_j is called the *jth successor of v* for every $j\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$. A list $\langle v_1,m_1,\ldots,v_{k-1},m_{k-1},v_k\rangle$ consisting of nodes $v_1,\ldots,v_m$ of a term graph G and naturals $m_1,\ldots,m_{k-1}$ is called a *path* from v_1 to v_k if v_{j+1} is the m_jth successor of v_j for each $j\in$



Fig. 1. Examples of graph rewrite rules

$\{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. A labeled graph $(G, \mathsf{lab}_G, \mathsf{succ}_G)$ is *closed* if the labeling function lab_G is total. Given two labeled graphs G and H, a *homomorphism* from G to h is a mapping $\varphi : V_G \to V_H$ such that

- $\mathsf{lab}_H(\varphi(v)) = \mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ for each $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{lab}_G) \subseteq V_G$, and
- for each $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{lab}_G)$, if $\mathsf{succ}_G(v) = v_1, \ldots, v_k$, then $\mathsf{succ}_H(\varphi(v)) = \varphi(v_1), \ldots, \varphi(v_k)$.

By definition, these conditions are not required for a node $v \in V_G$ for which $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is not defined. A quadruple $(G, \mathsf{lab}_G, \mathsf{succ}_G, \mathsf{root}_G)$ is a *term graph* if $(G, \mathsf{lab}_G, \mathsf{succ}_G)$ is a labeled graph and root_G is a *root* of G, i.e., a unique node in V_G from which every node is reachable. We write $\mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ to denote the set of term graphs over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. For a labeled graph $G = (G, \mathsf{succ}_G, \mathsf{lab}_G)$ and a node $v \in V_G$, $G \restriction v$ denotes the sub-term graph of G rooted at v. A homomorphism φ from a term graph G to another term graph H is a homomorphism $\varphi : (G, \mathsf{lab}_G, \mathsf{succ}_G) \to (H, \mathsf{lab}_H, \mathsf{succ}_H)$ such that $\mathsf{root}_H = \varphi(\mathsf{root}_G)$. Two term graphs G and H are *isomorphic*, denoted as $G \cong H$, if there exists a bijective homomorphism from G to H. A *graph rewrite rule* is a triple $\rho = (G, l, r)$ of a labeled graph G and distinct two nodes l and r respectively called the *left* and *right* root. The term rewrite rule $\mathsf{g}(x, y) \to \mathsf{c}(y, y)$ is expressed by a graph rewrite rule (1) and $\mathsf{h}(x, y, z, w) \to \mathsf{c}(z, w)$ is expressed by (2) in Figure 1. In the examples, the left root is written in a circle while the right root is in a square. Undefined nodes are indicated as $\perp$. Namely, undefined nodes behave as free variable. A *redex* in a term graph G is a pair (R, φ) of a rewrite rule $R = (H, l, r)$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : H \restriction l \to G$. Intuitively, according to the homomorphism φ, the subgraph $G \restriction \varphi(l)$ to which $H \restriction l$ is homomorphic by φ is replaced with the term graph to which $H \restriction r$ is homomorphic. A set $\mathcal{G}$ of graph rewrite rules is called a *graph rewrite system* (GRS for short). A graph rewrite rule (G, l, r) is called a *constructor* one if $\mathsf{lab}_G(l) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathsf{lab}_G(v) \in \mathcal{C}$ for any $v \in V_{G\restriction l} \setminus \{l\}$ whenever $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is defined. A GRS $\mathcal{G}$ is called a constructor one if $\mathcal{G}$ consists only of constructor rewrite rules. The rewrite relation defined by a GRS $\mathcal{G}$ is denoted as $\to_{\mathcal{G}}$, its m-fold iteration as $\to_{\mathcal{G}}^{m}$, and its reflective and transitive closure is denoted as $\to_{\mathcal{G}}^{*}$. The *innermost* rewrite relation is defined in a natural way, denoted as $\xrightarrow{\mathsf{i}}_{\mathcal{G}}$, and $\xrightarrow{\mathsf{i}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{m}$, $\xrightarrow{\mathsf{i}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{*}$ are defined accordingly.

3 Unfolding graph rewrite rules for general safe recursion

In this section we specify the shape of unfolding graph rewrite rules which compatible with the schema of (**General Safe Recursion**). We start with recalling the definition of unfolding graph rewrite rules presented in [8].

Definition 3.1 (Unfolding graph rewrite rules). Let Σ and Θ be two disjoint signatures in bijective correspondence by $\varphi : \Sigma \to \Theta$. For a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, suppose that $\mathsf{arity}(\varphi(g)) = 2\mathsf{arity}(g) + k$ for each $g \in \Sigma$. Let $f \notin \Sigma \cup \Theta$ be a fresh function symbol such that $\mathsf{arity}(f) = 1 + k$. Given a natural $m \geq 1$, an *unfolding graph rewrite rule over Σ and Θ defining f* is a graph rewrite rule $\rho = (G, l, r)$ where $G = (V_G, E_G, \mathsf{succ}_G, \mathsf{lab}_G)$ is a labeled graph over a signature $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \Sigma \cup \Theta$ that fulfills the following conditions.

1. The set V_G of vertices consists of $1 + 2m + k$ elements y, $v_1, \ldots, v_m$, $w_1, \ldots, w_m$, $x_1, \ldots, x_k$.
2. $l = y$ and $r = w_1$.
3. $\mathsf{lab}_G(y) = f$ and $\mathsf{succ}_G(y) = v_1, x_1, \ldots, x_k$.
4. $\mathsf{lab}_G(x_j)$ is undefined for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.
5. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $\mathsf{succ}_G(v_j) \subseteq \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}^*$. Moreover, $V_{G \restriction v_1} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$.
6. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_j) \in \Sigma$ and $\mathsf{lab}_G(w_j) = \varphi(\mathsf{lab}_G(v_j))$.
7. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $\mathsf{succ}_G(w_j) = v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_n}, x_1, \ldots, x_k, w_{j_1}, \ldots, w_{j_n}$ if $\mathsf{succ}_G(v_j) = v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_n}$.

Example 3.2. Let $\Sigma = \{\mathsf{0}, \mathsf{s}\}$, $\Theta = \{\mathsf{g}, \mathsf{h}\}$, $\varphi : \Sigma \to \Theta$ be a bijection defined as $\mathsf{0} \mapsto g$ and $\mathsf{s} \mapsto \mathsf{h}$, and $\mathsf{f} \notin \Sigma \cup \Theta$, where the arities of $\mathsf{0}, \mathsf{s}, \mathsf{g}, \mathsf{h}, \mathsf{f}$ are respectively 0, 1, 1, 3 and 2. Namely we consider the case $k = 1$. The standard equations $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{0}, x) \to \mathsf{g}(x)$, $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(y), x) \to \mathsf{h}(y, x, \mathsf{f}(y, x))$ for primitive recursion can be expressed by the infinite set of unfolding graph rewrite rules over $\mathcal{F} = \Sigma \cup \Theta \cup \{\mathsf{f}\}$ defining f, which includes the rewrite rules pictured in Figure 2. As seen from the pictures, the unfolding graph rewrite rules in Figure 2 express the infinite instances $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{0}, x) \to \mathsf{g}(x)$, $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}), x) \to \mathsf{h}(\mathsf{0}, x, \mathsf{g}(x))$, $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0})), x) \to \mathsf{h}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}), x, \mathsf{h}(\mathsf{0}, x, \mathsf{g}(x)))$, ..., representing terms as term graphs.

In [8] a graph rewrite system $\mathcal{G}$ is called *polytime presentable* if there exists a deterministic polytime algorithm which, given a term graph G, returns a term graph H such that $G \xrightarrow{\mathsf{i}}_{\mathcal{G}} H$ if such a term graph exists, or the value false if otherwise. In addition, a GRS $\mathcal{G}$ is *polynomially bounded* if there exists a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\max\{m, |H|\} \leq p(|G|)$ holds whenever $G \xrightarrow{\mathsf{i}}{}^{m}_{\mathcal{G}} H$ holds. The main result in [8] is restated as follows.

Theorem 3.3 (Dal Lago, Martini and Zorzi [8]). *Every general safe recursive function can be represented by a polytime presentable and polynomially bounded constructor GRS.*

In the proof of Theorem 3.3, the case that a general safe recursive function is defined by (**General Safe Recursion**) is witnessed by an infinite set of unfolding



Fig. 2. Examples of unfolding graph rewrite rules

graph rewrite rules in a specific shape compatible with the argument separation as indicated in the schema (**General Safe Recursion**). To be compatible with the argument separation, in [8], for any redex (R, φ), the homomorphism φ is restricted to an *injective* one. In this paper, instead of assuming injectivity of homomorphisms, we rather indicate the argument separation explicitly.

Definition 3.4 (Term graphs with the argument separation). In accordance with idea of safe recursion, we assume that the argument positions of every function symbol are separated into the normal and safe ones, writing $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k\,; x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l})$ to denote k normal arguments and l safe ones. We always assume that every constructor symbol in $\mathcal{C}$ has safe argument positions only. We take the argument separation into labeled graphs in such a way that for every successor u of a node v we write $u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)$ if u is connected to a normal argument position of $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$, and $u \in \mathsf{safe}(v)$ if otherwise. For two distinct nodes v_0 and v_1, if $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_0) = \mathsf{lab}_G(v_1)$, then, for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, \mathsf{arity}(\mathsf{lab}_G(v_0))\}$, $u_0 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_0) \Leftrightarrow u_1 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_1)$ for the jth successor u_i of v_i $(i = 0, 1)$. Notationally, we write $\mathsf{succ}_G(v) = v_1, \ldots, v_k\,; v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l}$ to express the separation that $v_1, \ldots, v_k \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)$ and $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l} \in \mathsf{safe}(v)$. We assume that for any term graph $(G, \mathsf{lab}_G, \mathsf{succ}_G, \mathsf{root}_G)$ and for any node $v \in V_G$, either 1 or 2 below holds.

1. For any path $\langle v_0, m_0, \ldots, v_{k-1}, m_{k-1}, v_k\rangle$ $(1 \leq k)$ in G, if $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_0) \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_j) \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, and $v_k = v$, then $v_1 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_0)$.
2. For any path $\langle v_0, m_0, \ldots, v_{k-1}, m_{k-1}, v_k\rangle$ $(1 \leq k)$ in G, if $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_0) \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_j) \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, and $v_k = v$, then $v_1 \in \mathsf{safe}(v_0)$.

Accordingly, we assume that any homomorphism $\varphi : G \to H$ preserves the argument separation. Namely, for each $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{lab}_G)$, if $\mathsf{succ}_G(v) = v_1, \ldots, v_k$; $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l}$, then $\mathsf{succ}_H(\varphi(v)) = \varphi(v_1), \ldots, \varphi(v_k)\,; \varphi(v_{k+1}), \ldots, \varphi(v_{k+l})$.

Example 3.5. Let us consider graph representations of the term $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{g}(\mathsf{s}(0), \mathsf{s}(0)), \mathsf{h}(\mathsf{s}(0), \mathsf{s}(0)))$. All the graphs described in Figure 3 are valid graph representations of the term. On the other hand, consider the argument separation $\mathsf{f}(x\,; y)$,



Fig. 3. Examples of terms graphs with the argument separation

$\mathsf{g}(x\,;y)$, $\mathsf{h}(x\,;y)$ and the partition $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathsf{0},\mathsf{s}\}$, $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathsf{f},\mathsf{g},\mathsf{h}\}$ of the signature. Then, among the four graphs in Figure 3, the first and second ones are valid representations of the term $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{g}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0})\,;\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}))\,;\mathsf{h}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0})\,;\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0})))$ but the others are not valid representations.

Let us recall the idea of safe recursion that the number of recursive calls is measured only by a normal argument and recursion terms can be substituted only for safe arguments. This motivates us to introduce the following safe version of unfolding graph rewrite rules.

Definition 3.6 (Safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules). We call an unfolding graph rewrite rule *safe recursive* if the following constraints imposed on the clause 3 and 7 in Definition 3.1 are satisfied.

1. In the clause 3, $v_1 \in \mathsf{nrm}(y)$.
2. In the clause 7, $v_{j_1},\ldots,v_{j_n} \in \mathsf{nrm}(w_j)$ and $w_{j_1},\ldots,w_{j_n} \in \mathsf{safe}(w_j)$.
3. In the clause 3 and 7, for each $j \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$, $x_j \in \mathsf{nrm}(y)$ if and only if $x_j \in \mathsf{nrm}(w_i)$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$.

As a consequence of Definition 3.6, we have a basic property of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules, which ensures that rewriting by the graph rewrite rules does not change the structures of subgraphs in normal argument positions.

Corollary 3.7. *Let (G, y, w_1) be a safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rule with the set V_G of vertices consisting of $1+2m+k+l$ elements y, $v_1,\ldots,v_m$, $w_1,\ldots,w_m$, $x_1,\ldots,x_{k+l}$ specified as in Definition 3.1 and 3.6, where $\mathsf{succ}_G(y) = v_1, x_1, \ldots, x_k\,; x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}$. Then, for any $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and any node $u \in \mathsf{nrm}(w_j)$, one of the following two cases holds.*

1. *If $\mathsf{lab}_G(u)$ is defined, then $u = v_i$ for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, and hence there exists a path from v_1 to u in $G \restriction y$.*
2. *If $\mathsf{lab}_G(u)$ is undefined, then $u = x_i$ for some $i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$, and hence $u \in \mathsf{nrm}(y)$.*

4 Termination orders on sequences of terms

In this section we consider a termination order $>_\ell$ indexed by a positive natural ℓ over sequences of terms based on an observation that every instance of unfolding graph rewrite rules is precedence terminating in the sense defined in [11]. Essentially, the termination order $>_\ell$ is the same as *small polynomial path orders on sequences* [3] but without recursive comparison. We show that, for any fixed ℓ, the length of any $>_\ell$-reduction sequence can be linearly bounded measured by the size of a starting term but polynomially bounded if measured by ℓ (Lemma 4.5).

Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$ be a signature. The set of terms over $\mathcal{F}$ (and the set $\mathcal{V}$ of variables) is denoted as $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, and the set of closed terms is denoted as $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. We write $s \rhd t$ to express that s is a *proper super-term* of t. A *precedence* $>$ is a well founded partial binary relation on $\mathcal{F}$. The *rank* $\mathsf{rk} : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{N}$ is defined to be compatible with $>$: $\mathsf{rk}(f) > \mathsf{rk}(g) \Leftrightarrow f > g$. We always assume that every constructor symbol is $>$-minimal. To form sequences of terms, assume an auxiliary function symbol $\circ$ whose arity is finite but arbitrary. A term of the form $\circ(t_1, \ldots, t_k)$ will be called a sequence if $t_1, \ldots, t_k \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$, denoted as $[t_1 \ \cdots \ t_k]$. We will write $a, b, c, \ldots$ for both terms and sequences. We also write $[s_1 \ \cdots \ s_k]^\frown[t_1 \ \cdots \ t_l]$ to denote the concatenation $[\, s_1 \ \cdots \ s_k \ t_1 \ \cdots \ t_l \,]$.

Definition 4.1. Let $>$ be a precedence on a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose that $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq \ell$. Then $a >_\ell b$ holds if one of the following three cases holds.

1. $a = f(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$, $b = g(t_1, \ldots, t_l)$, $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $f > g$,
   - $f(s_1, \ldots, s_k) \rhd t_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, and
   - $l \leq \ell$.
2. $a = f(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$, $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $b = [\, t_1 \cdots t_l \,]$,
   - $f(s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_\ell t_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, and
   - $l \leq \ell$.
3. $a = [\, s_1 \cdots s_k \,]$, $b = [\, t_1 \cdots t_l \,]$ and there exists a permutation $\pi : \{1, \ldots, l\} \to \{1, \ldots, l\}$, and there exist terms or sequences b_j $(j = 1, \ldots, k)$ such that
   - $b_1{}^\frown \cdots {}^\frown b_k = [\, t_{\pi(1)} \cdots t_{\pi(l)} \,]$,
   - $s_j \geqslant_\ell b_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, and
   - $s_i >_\ell b_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

   In case some b_i is a term t, the concatenation $\cdots{}^\frown b_i{}^\frown \cdots$ should be understood as $\cdots{}^\frown[\, t \,]^\frown \cdots$.

For notational convention, we write $a >_\ell^{\langle \mathrm{i} \rangle} b$ if $a >_\ell b$ follows from the i-th clause in Definition 4.1. Note for example that if $s >_\ell^{\langle 2 \rangle} [t_1 \ \cdots \ t_l]$, then $s >_\ell^{\langle 1 \rangle} t_j$ holds for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$. As a special case, $s >_\ell^{\langle 2 \rangle} [\,]$ holds for any $\ell \geq 2$ and any term s, and hence $a >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} [\,]$ holds for any non-empty sequence a.

Lemma 4.2. *1. If $a >_\ell b$ and $\ell \leq \ell'$, then $a >_{\ell'} b$ holds.*
2. If $a >_\ell a'$ holds, then $b{}^\frown a{}^\frown c >_\ell b{}^\frown a'{}^\frown c$ also holds.
3. If $s >_\ell^{\langle 2 \rangle} b$, $b = b_0{}^\frown b_1$ and $b_j \neq [\,]$ for each $j = 0, 1$, then $[\, s \,]^\frown c >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} b_0{}^\frown c{}^\frown b_1$ holds for any sequence c.

Proof. Property 1 and 2 can be shown as in [3, Lemma 9]. Consider Property 3. The case $c = [\,]$ immediately follows from the assumption. Let $b_0 = [\,t_1 \cdots t_{k_0}\,]$, $b_1 = [\,t_{k_0+l+1} \cdots t_{k_0+l+k_1}\,]$, and $c = [\,t_{k_0+1} \cdots t_{k_0+l}\,]$. Define a permutation on $\pi : \{1, \ldots, k_0 + l + k_1\}$ by

$$\pi(j) = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_0\}, \\ j + k_1 & \text{if } j \in \{k_0 + 1, \ldots, k_0 + l\}, \\ j - l & \text{if } j \in \{k_0 + l + 1, \ldots, k_0 + l + k_1\}. \end{cases}$$

Then we have $b_0{}^\frown c{}^\frown b_1 = [\,t_1 \cdots t_{k_0+l+k_1}\,]$ and $b{}^\frown c = [\,t_{\pi(1)} \cdots t_{\pi(k_0+l+k_1)}\,]$. Now $a{}^\frown c >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} b_0{}^\frown c{}^\frown b_1$ follows from $s >_\ell b$ and $t_j \geqslant_\ell t_j$ for every $j \in \{k_0 + 1, \ldots, k_0 + l\}$. □

Since the relation $>_\ell$ can be regarded as a fragment of small polynomial path orders on sequences defined in [3], $>_\ell$ is well founded for any fixed $\ell \geq 1$. Therefore the following complexity measure $\mathsf{G}_\ell : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{N}$ can be well defined.

Definition 4.3. $\mathsf{G}_\ell(a) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists a_1, \ldots, a_k \text{ such that } a >_\ell a_1 >_\ell \cdots >_\ell a_k\}$

Note that $\mathsf{G}_\ell(a) > \mathsf{G}_\ell(b)$ holds whenever $a >_\ell b$ holds. As employed in [3], the following basic of G_ℓ property can be shown, whose proof can be found in [4, Lemma 7].

Lemma 4.4. *For any $\ell \geq 1$ and sequence $a = [\,t_1 \cdots t_k\,]$, $\mathsf{G}_\ell(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{G}_\ell(t_j)$ holds.*

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\ell \geq 1$ and $\max\{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\} \leq d$. Then, for any function symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with arity $k \leq \ell$ and for any closed terms $s_1, \ldots, s_k \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C})$, the following inequality holds, where $\mathsf{dp}(t)$ denotes the* depth *of a term t in the standard tree representation.*

$$\mathsf{G}_\ell(f(s_1, \ldots, s_k)) \leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1 + \ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot \left(1 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right).$$

Proof. Let $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$. We show the lemma by induction on $\mathsf{rk}(f)$. In the base case $\mathsf{rk}(f) = 0$, all the possible reduction is $f(s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_\ell [\,]$, and hence $\mathsf{G}_\ell(s) \leq 1$. For the induction step, suppose $\mathsf{rk}(f) > 0$. It suffices to show that for any b, if $s >_\ell b$, then $\mathsf{G}_\ell(b) < d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1 + \ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right)$ holds. This is shown by case analysis splitting into $s >_\ell^{\langle 1 \rangle} b$ and $s >_\ell^{\langle 2 \rangle} b$

Case. $s >_\ell^{\langle 1 \rangle} b = g(t_1, \ldots, t_l)$: In this case, $f >_\mathcal{F} g$, $s \rhd t_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, and $l \leq \ell$. Since $\mathsf{rk}(f) > \mathsf{rk}(g)$, the induction hypothesis yields $\mathsf{G}_\ell(b) \leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(g)} \cdot (1 + \ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(g)} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{l} \mathsf{dp}(t_j)\right)$. On the other hand, $1 + \sum_{j=1}^{l} \mathsf{dp}(t_j) \leq d\left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{G}_\ell(b) &\leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(g)} \cdot (1 + \ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(g)} \cdot d\left(1 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right) \\ &\leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1 + \ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)-1} \cdot \left(1 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

CASE. $s >_\ell^{\langle 2\rangle} b = [t_1 \cdots t_l]$: In this case, $l \leq \ell$ and $s >_\ell^{\langle 1\rangle} t_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$. By (1) in the previous case, $\mathsf{G}_\ell(t_j) \leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1+\ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)-1} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right)$ holds for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{G}_\ell(b) &\leq \ell \cdot d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1+\ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)-1} \cdot \left(1 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right) \qquad \text{(by Lemma 4.2.4.4)} \\ &< d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1+\ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot \left(1 + \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

5 Predicative embedding of safe recursive unfolding graph rewriting into $>_\ell$

In this section we present the *predicative* interpretation of term graphs into sequences of terms, showing that, by the interpretation, rewriting sequences by safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules can be embedded into the termination order $>_\ell$ presented in the previous section (Theorem 5.9). This yields that the length of any rewriting sequence by safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules starting with a term graphs whose arguments are already normalised can be bounded by a polynomial in the sizes of the normal argument subgraphs only. The predicative interpretation is defined modifying the predicative interpretations for terms, which stem from [1] and are employed in [5,2,3].

Definition 5.1. 1. A path $\langle v_1, m_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}, m_{k-1}, v_k\rangle$ in a term graph G is called a *safe* one if $v_{j+1} \in \mathsf{safe}(v_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$.
2. Given a signature $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$, we define a subset $\mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ with $\mathsf{succ}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) = v_1, \ldots, v_k\,; v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ if $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$, or $G \restriction v_j \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $G \restriction v_j \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ for each $j \in \{k+1, \ldots, k+l\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a set of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ and $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$.*

1. *For any redex (R, φ) in G with a rewrite rule $R = (H, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : H \restriction l \to G$, the node $\varphi(l)$ lies on a safe path from root_G in G.*
2. *If $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $H \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. PROPERTY 1. Assume that $\varphi(l)$ is not on any safe path from root_G. Then, there exists a path $\langle v_0, m_0, \ldots, v_{k-1}, m_{k-1}, v_k\rangle$ such that $v_k = \varphi(l)$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_j) \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $v_1 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_0)$. Since constructor symbols only have safe arguments, it holds that $\mathsf{lab}_G(v_0) \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence, by the condition 1 in Definition 3.4, for any path $\langle u_0, n_0, \ldots, u_{l-1}, n_{l-1}, u_l\rangle$ $(1 \leq k)$ in G, if $u_l = \varphi(l)$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(u_0) \in \mathcal{D}$, and $\mathsf{lab}_G(u_j) \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, then $u_1 \in \mathsf{nrm}(u_0)$. This means $G \restriction v_1 \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$ by the definition of the class $\mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(F)$, and thus $G \restriction \varphi(l) = (G \restriction v_1) \restriction \varphi(l)$ is not rewritable.



Fig. 4. Interpretation of term graphs into unlabeled graphs

PROPERTY 2. Suppose that G results in H by applying a redex (R, φ) for a rule $R = (G_0, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$. Since $\varphi(l)$ lies on a safe path from root_G by Property 1, it suffices to show that $H \restriction r' \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ for the node $r' \in H$ corresponding to $r \in V_{G_0}$. Let $v \in V_{H\restriction r'} \setminus \{r'\}$. By structural induction over $H \restriction v$, employing Corollary 3.7, it can be shown that $H \restriction v \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$ if $v \in \mathsf{nrm}(u)$ for some $u \in V_{H\restriction r'}$, and $H \restriction v \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ if $v \in \mathsf{safe}(u)$ for some $u \in V_{H\restriction r'}$. Then $H \restriction r' \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ follows accordingly. □

Definition 5.3 (Interpretation of term graphs into unlabeled graphs). In order to define the predicative interpretation, we define an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ of term graphs into *unlabeled graphs*. For a term graph G, $\mathcal{J}(G)$ denotes the directed graph $(V_{\mathcal{J}(G)}, E_{\mathcal{J}(G)})$ with the root $\mathsf{root}_{\mathcal{J}(G)} = \mathsf{root}_G$ consisting of the set $V_{\mathcal{J}(G)} = V_G$ of vertices, and the set $E_{\mathcal{J}(G)}$ of edges defined as follows. For an edge $(u, v) \in E_G$, $(u, v) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(G)}$ holds if either 1 or 2 below holds.

1. There are no distinct two safe paths from root_G to v.
2. The edge (u, v) lies on a safe path $\langle u_1, m_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}, m_{k-1}, v\rangle$ from root_G to v, i.e., $u_1 = \mathsf{root}_G$ and $u_{k-1} = u$, and, for any distinct safe path $\langle v_1, n_1, \ldots, v_{l-1}, n_{l-1}, v\rangle$ from root_G to v, $m_i < n_j$ holds whenever $u_i = v_j$ and $m_i \neq n_j$. Namely, a safe path is kept by the interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ if it is the leftmost one.

Example 5.4. Let us consider a term graph G pictured in Figure 4 with $\mathsf{succ}_G(v_0) = u_1, u_2\,; v_1, v_2$ and $\mathsf{succ}_G(v_1) = u_2\,; v_2, v_2$. Since $u_1, u_2 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_0)$ and $u_2 \in \mathsf{nrm}(v_1)$, all of the edges (v_0, u_1), (u_1, u_2), (v_0, u_2) and (v_1, u_2) are trivially preserved. The path $\langle v_0, 3, v_1\rangle$ is the unique safe path from root_G to v_1, and hence the edge (v_0, v_1) is preserved as well. Consider the edge $(v_1, v_2) \in E_G$. There are two distinct safe paths $\langle v_0, 3, v_1, 2, v_2\rangle$ and $\langle v_0, 3, v_1, 3, v_2\rangle$ from root_G to v_2. The node v_1 lies on the both safe paths, and hence the edge (v_1, v_2) is also preserved. Finally, consider the edge $(v_0, v_2) \in E_G$. There are three distinct safe paths $\langle v_0, 3, v_1, 2, v_2\rangle$, $\langle v_0, 3, v_1, 3, v_2\rangle$ and $\langle v_0, 4, v_2\rangle$ from root_G to v_2. The edge (v_0, v_2) lies only on the last one, which is not the leftmost, and thus the edge (v_0, v_2) is not preserved. Summing up, we obtain the unlabeled graph $\mathcal{J}(G)$ as pictured in Figure 4.

For each function symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with k normal argument positions, let f_{n} denote a fresh function symbol with k argument positions. We write $\mathcal{F}_{\mathsf{n}}$ to denote

the new signature $\{f_{\mathsf{n}} \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For a term graph G, we write $\mathsf{term}(G)$ to denote the standard term representation of G, i.e., $\mathsf{term}(G) = \mathsf{lab}_G(\mathsf{root}_G)(\mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_k)\,; \mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_{k+1}), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_{k+l}))$ if $\mathsf{succ}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) = v_1, \ldots, v_k\,; v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l}$. For two successors v_0, v_1 of a node v, if v_j is the k_jth successor for each $j \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k_0 < k_1$, then we write $v_0 <_{(G,v)} v_1$, or simply write $v_0 < v_1$ if no confusion likely arises. Furthermore, we extend the notation $G \restriction v$ to unlabeled (acyclic) directed graphs in the most natural way.

Definition 5.5 (Predicative interpretation of term graphs). Let G be a closed term graph over a signature $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$, $f = \mathsf{lab}_G(\mathsf{root}_G)$, and $\mathsf{succ}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) = v_1, \ldots, v_k\,; v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{\mathsf{arity}(f)}$. Suppose that $\{u_1, \ldots, u_n\} = \{v \in V_G \mid v \in \mathsf{safe}(\mathsf{root}_G)$ and $(\mathsf{root}_G, v) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(G)}\}$ and $u_1 < \cdots < u_n$. Then we define an interpretation $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{F}_{\mathsf{n}} \cup \{\circ\})$ by

$$\mathcal{I}(G) = \begin{cases} [\,] \quad \text{(the empty sequence)} & \text{if } G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C}), \\ [\,f_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_k))\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction u_1)^\frown \cdots {}^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction u_n) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

We note that, for a node $v \in G$, $\mathcal{J}(G \restriction v) = \mathcal{J}(G) \restriction v$ does not hold in general. Thus it should be understood that the result $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction v)$ of the interpretation depends on $\mathcal{J}(G) \restriction v$ not on $\mathcal{J}(G \restriction v)$.

Example 5.6. Consider again the term graph G in Example 5.4. Let $\mathsf{f} = \mathsf{lab}_G(v_0)$, $\mathsf{s} = \mathsf{lab}_G(u_1)$, $\mathsf{0} = \mathsf{lab}_G(u_2)$, $\mathsf{h} = \mathsf{lab}_G(v_1)$, $\mathsf{g} = \mathsf{lab}_G(v_2)$, and $\mathsf{h}, \mathsf{g} \in \mathcal{D}$. Then inductively one can see that the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ works for G as follows.

$\mathcal{I}(G \restriction v_2) = [\,\mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\,]$,
$\mathcal{I}(G \restriction v_1) = [\,\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{0})\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction v_2) = [\,\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{0})\ \mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\,]$,
$\mathcal{I}(G) = [\,\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}), \mathsf{0})\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction v_1) = [\,\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}), \mathsf{0})\ \mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{0})\ \mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\,]$.

If the interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ is not performed, then G would be translated into the sequence $[\,\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{s}(\mathsf{0}), \mathsf{0})\ \mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{0})\ \mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\ \mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\ \mathsf{g}_{\mathsf{n}}\,]$, in which the term g_{n} is duplicated unnecessarily.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a set of safe recursive constructor unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$ is induced by a redex (R, φ) in a closed term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ for a rule $R = (G', l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : G' \restriction l \to G$. Let $r' \in V_H$ the node corresponding to $r \in V_{G'}$. Then, for the interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ defined for G and H, $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction \varphi(l)) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H \restriction r')$ holds for $\ell = \max(\{|G' \restriction r|\} \cup \{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\})$.*

Proof. Let $R = (G', l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ define a function symbol f over $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \Sigma \cup \Theta$ with $\mathsf{arity}(f) = 1 + k + l$. In case $H \restriction r' \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$, clearly $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction \varphi(l)) >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} [\,] = \mathcal{I}(H \restriction r')$ holds since $G \restriction \varphi(l) \notin \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$. In the sequel, we suppose $H \restriction r' \notin \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$. Let the set $V_{G'}$ of vertices consist of $y, v_1, \ldots, v_m, w_1, \ldots, w_m, x_1, \ldots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}$ as specified in Definition 3.1 and 3.6, where $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \subseteq \mathsf{nrm}(y)$ and $\{x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}\} \subseteq \mathsf{safe}(y)$ hold. In particular, $l = y$, $r = w_1$ and $\mathsf{lab}_{G'}(l) = f$ hold by definition. To make the presentation simpler, let us identify the nodes $y, v_1, \ldots, v_m, x_1, \ldots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l} \in V_{G' \restriction l}$ with the nodes in V_G corresponding by the homomorphism φ and the nodes $v_2, \ldots, v_m$, $w_1, \ldots, w_m$, $x_1, \ldots, x_k$,

$x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l} \in V_{G' \restriction r}$ with the corresponding nodes in V_H, e.g., $y = \varphi(l)$ and $w_1 = r'$. We write g to denote $\mathsf{lab}_H(w_1)$. Then, by the interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ defined for G and H, the term graphs $G \restriction y$ and $H \restriction w_1$ are respectively transformed into the following sequences of terms.

$$\mathcal{I}(G \restriction y) = [\, f_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(G \restriction v_1), \mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_k))\,] \frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction z_1) \frown \cdots \frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction z_{l'}),$$

$$\mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_1) = [g_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(H \restriction v_{j_1}), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(H \restriction v_{j_n}), \mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_k))] \frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction z_1) \frown \cdots \frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction z_{l'}) \frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction u_1) \frown \cdots \frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction u_{n'}),$$

where $\mathsf{succ}_G(v_1) = v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_n}$, and $z_1, \ldots, z_{l'}$ and $u_1, \ldots, u_{n'}$ denotes the sequence of nodes such that

- $\{z_1, \ldots, z_{l'}\} = \{v \in \{x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}\} \mid (y, v) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(G)\restriction y}\} = \{v \in \{x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}\} \mid (w_1, v) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(H)\restriction w_1}\}$, $z_1 < \cdots < z_{l'}$, and
- $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{n'}\} = \{v \in \{w_{j_1}, \ldots, w_{j_n}\} \mid (w_1, v) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(H)\restriction w_1}\}$ and $u_1 < \cdots < u_{n'}$.

Define a precedence $>$ over $\mathcal{F}_{\mathsf{n}}$ as $f_{\mathsf{n}} > h_{\mathsf{n}}$ for any $h \in \Theta$. Write s to denote $\mathsf{term}(G' \restriction v_1)$, s_j to denote $\mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, t_i to denote $\mathsf{term}(H \restriction v_{j_i})$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n'\}$, and write t'_j to denote $\mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_j)$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. First we show that $f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_\ell g_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1, \ldots, t_n, t'_1, \ldots, t'_k)$ holds. Since $V_{G\restriction v_1} = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$ by definition, any of $H \restriction v_{j_1}, \ldots, H \restriction v_{j_n}$ is a subgraph of $G \restriction v_1$, and hence any of $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ is a subterm of s. This yields $f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) \rhd t_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Moreover, since $t_i = t'_i$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) \rhd t'_i$ also holds for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. These together with $f_{\mathsf{n}} > g_{\mathsf{n}}$ and $\mathsf{arity}(g_{\mathsf{n}}) \leq \mathsf{arity}(\mathsf{g})$ imply

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_d^{\langle 1 \rangle} g_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1, \ldots, t_n, t'_1, \ldots, t'_k), \tag{2}$$

where $d := \max\{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, let $\ell_i = \max\{|V_{\mathsf{safe}(w_i)}|, d\}$, where

$$V_{\mathsf{safe}(u)} := V_{\mathcal{J}(H)\restriction u} \cap \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\}.$$

By structural induction over $H \restriction w_i$, one can show that

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_{\ell_i}^{\langle 2 \rangle} \mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_i) \tag{3}$$

holds for every $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$ for the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ defined for H. The base case can be shown in the same way as we proved (2). Since $\mathsf{succ}_H(w_1) = v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_n}, x_1, \ldots, x_k\,; x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}, w_{j_1}, \ldots, w_{j_n}$, there is no edge $(w_i, x_j) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(H)}$ for any $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Hence, instead of proving the general induction step, it would suffice to show the following orientation assuming (3).

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(s, s_1, \ldots, s_k) >_{\ell_1}^{\langle 2 \rangle} [\, g_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1, \ldots, t_n, t'_1, \ldots, t'_k)\,] \frown \mathcal{I}(G' \restriction u_1) \frown \cdots \frown \mathcal{I}(G' \restriction u_{n'}). \tag{4}$$

By the definition of the interpretation $\mathcal{J}$, $V_{\mathsf{safe}(u_1)}, \ldots, V_{\mathsf{safe}(u_{n'})}$ are pair-wise disjoint, and hence $|V_{\mathsf{safe}(w_1)}| = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n'} |V_{\mathsf{safe}(u_j)}|$. This together with (2) enables us to deduce (4). Replacing ℓ_1 with ℓ by Lemma 4.2.1, the orientation (4) together with Lemma 4.2.3 now allows us to conclude $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction y) >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} \mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_1)$. □

Let $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\mathsf{succ}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) = v_1, \ldots, v_k$. We call G a *basic* term graph if $\mathsf{lab}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $G \restriction v_j \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. By definition, $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ holds for any basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. For any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^* H$, then, for any node $v \in V_H$ on a safe path from root_H, $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ holds.*

Proof. Suppose $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^n H$. By induction on $n \geq 0$ we show that for any node $v \in V_H$ on a safe path from root_H with $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ holds. In the base case $n = 0$, $H = G$ and hence the assertion follows trivially.

For the induction step, suppose that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^n H$ holds and that $H \to_{\mathcal{G}} K$ is induced by a redex (R, φ) in H for a rewrite rule $R = (H', l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : H' \restriction l \to H$. Then $H, K \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ holds by Lemma 5.2.2. Let a node $v \in V_K$ lie on a safe path from root_K.

Case. $\varphi(l) = \mathsf{root}_H$: In this case, $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H \restriction u}|$ follows from Corollary 3.7. Since root_H lies on the trivial safe path from root_H, $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ holds by induction hypothesis, and thus $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ also holds.

Case. $\varphi(l) \neq \mathsf{root}_H$: Let $r' \in H$ denote the node corresponding to $r \in H'$. First consider the subcase $v \in V_{K \restriction r'}$. In this subcase, as in the previous case, $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}|$ follows from Corollary 3.7. Since $\varphi(l)$ lies on a safe path from root_H by Lemma 5.2.1, $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ holds by induction hypothesis, and thus $|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|$ holds.

Consider the subcase $v \notin V_{K \restriction r'}$. As in the previous subcase, it holds that

$$|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(r')} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}|. \tag{5}$$

On the other side, since $V_{K \restriction v} \setminus V_{K \restriction r'} = V_{H \restriction v} \setminus V_{H \restriction \varphi(l)}$, it holds that

$$|\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u} \setminus \bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(r')} V_{K \restriction u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H \restriction u} \setminus \bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}|. \tag{6}$$

Combining the inequalities (5) and (6), we reason as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u}| &= |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{K \restriction u} \setminus \bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(r')} V_{K \restriction u}| + |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(r')} V_{K \restriction u}| \\ &\leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H \restriction u} \setminus \bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}| + |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{H \restriction u}| \\ &\leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H \restriction u}| \\ &\leq |\bigcup_{u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G \restriction u}|. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from induction hypothesis. □

Theorem 5.9. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose* $\max\{\mathsf{arity}(\mathsf{f}) \mid \mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}\} \leq d$. *Then, for any closed basic term graph $G_0 \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G_0 \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{*} G$ and $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $\mathcal{I}(G) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H)$ holds for $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\restriction v}| + d$.*

Proof. Given a closed basic term graph $G_0 \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, suppose that $G_0 \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{*} G$ and that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$ is induced by a redex (R, φ) in G for a rule $R = (G', l, r)$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : G' \restriction l \to G$. Then $G, H \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ holds by Lemma 5.2.2. Let $\mathsf{succ}_{G'}(l) = u_1, \ldots, u_k\,; u_{k+1}, \ldots, u_{k+l}$ and $\mathsf{succ}_G(\varphi(l)) = v_1, \ldots, v_k\,; v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+l}$. Since $|G' \restriction r| \leq 2|G' \restriction u_1| + d$ holds by the definition of unfolding graph rewrite rules, $|G' \restriction r| \leq 2|G' \restriction u_1| + d \leq 2|G \restriction v_1| + d$ holds. On the other hand, since $\varphi(l)$ lies on a safe path from root_G by Lemma 5.2.1, $|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\varphi(l))} V_{G\restriction v}| \leq |\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\restriction v}|$ holds by Lemma 5.8. Hence $|G' \restriction r| \leq 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\restriction v}| + d$ holds. Now let $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\restriction v}| + d$. In case $\varphi(l) = \mathsf{root}_G$, $\mathcal{I}(G) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H)$ follows from Lemma 5.7 (and Lemma 4.2.1). In case $\varphi(l) \neq \mathsf{root}_G$, $\mathcal{I}(G) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H)$ follows from Lemma 5.7, 5.2.1 and 4.2.2. □

Corollary 5.10. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Then there exists a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{m} H$ for some term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, then $m \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|)$ holds.*

Proof. Given an infinite set $\mathcal{G}$ of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$, let $\max\{\mathsf{arity}(\mathsf{f}) \mid \mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{F}\} \leq d$. In addition, given a closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, let $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + d$. Suppose that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{m} H$ holds for some term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$. By Theorem 5.9, any $\to_{\mathcal{G}}$ sequence starting with G can be embedded into some $>_\ell$ reduction sequence starting with $\mathcal{I}(G)$, and hence m can be bounded by $\mathsf{G}_\ell(\mathcal{I}(G))$. Write $[\,f(s_1, \ldots, s_k)\,]$ to denote $\mathcal{I}(G)$. Since $k \leq d \leq \ell$, Lemma 4.5 implies $\mathsf{G}_\ell(\mathcal{I}(G)) \leq d^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot (1+\ell)^{\mathsf{rk}(f)} \cdot \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j)\right)$. Now let p denote a polynomial such that

$$d^{\max\{\mathsf{rk}(f)|f\in\mathcal{F}\}} \cdot (1 + 2x + d)^{\max\{\mathsf{rk}(f)|f\in\mathcal{F}\}} \cdot (1 + dx) \leq p(x).$$

For every $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $s_j = \mathsf{term}(G \restriction v)$ for some $v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)$, and hence $\mathsf{dp}(s_j) \leq |G \restriction v|$ holds for some $v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)$. Thus $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathsf{dp}(s_j) \leq d \cdot |\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ holds. This together with $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + d$ allows us to conclude that $m \leq \mathsf{G}_\ell(\mathcal{I}(G)) \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|)$ holds. □

Lemma 5.11. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. For any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and for any term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{n} H$, then $|V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| \leq n \cdot |\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ holds.*

Proof. By induction on n. In the base case $n = 0$, $H = G$ and hence the assertion trivially holds. For the induction step, suppose $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{n} H$ and $H \to_{\mathcal{G}} K$. Let us observe that for any safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rule (G', l, r),

– $|V_{G'\restriction r} \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G'})} V_{G'\restriction v}| \leq |G' \restriction l|$, and
– for any node $v \in V_{G'\restriction r}$, if $\mathsf{lab}_{G'}(v)$ is undefined, then $v \in V_{G'\restriction l}$.

From the observation, it can be seen that $|V_K \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_K)} V_{K\restriction v}| \leq |H|$ holds. Namely, the following inequality holds.

$$|V_K \setminus \textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_K)} V_{K\restriction v}| \leq |\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| + |V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, Lemma 5.8 yields

$$|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| \leq |\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, induction hypothesis yields

$$|V_H \setminus \textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| \leq n\cdot|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{G\restriction v}|. \quad (9)$$

Combining the three inequalities (7), (8) and (9) allows us to conclude that $|V_K \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_K)} V_{K\restriction v}| \leq (n+1)\cdot|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ holds. □

Corollary 5.12. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Then there exists a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and for any term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to^*_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $|H| \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ holds.*

Proof. Given a closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, suppose that $G \to^m_{\mathcal{G}} H$ holds for some term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, Then, by Corollary 5.10, one can find a polynomial $q : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \leq q(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|)$ holds. Define a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ by $p(x) = (1 + q(x)) \cdot x$. Then we conclude as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|H| &= \left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}\right| + \left|V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}\right| \\
&\leq \left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right| + \left|V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}\right| \qquad \text{(by Lemma 5.8)} \\
&\leq (1+m)\left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right| + \left|V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right| \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.11)} \\
&\leq \left(1 + q\left(\left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right|\right)\right) \cdot \left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right| \\
&\qquad + \left|V_G \setminus \textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right| \quad \text{(by Corollary 5.10)} \\
&= p\left(\left|\textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right|\right) + \left|V_G \setminus \textstyle\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a consequence of Corollary 5.10 and 5.12, for any set $\mathcal{G}$ of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules, we can find a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and for any term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to^m_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $m \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|)$ and $|H| \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$.

6 Interpreting general safe recursive functions

Until the previous section, we have restricted every GRS to a set of safe recursive graph rewrite rules. In this section, to interpret all the general safe recursive functions, expanding safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules, we introduce *safe recursive graph rewrite systems* by which every general safe recursive function can be expressed. We show that every safe recursive GRS can be interpreted into the relation $>_\ell$ by the predicative interpretation defined in the previous section, sharpening the complexity result obtained in [8]. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of constructors and $m \mapsto c_m$ $(1 \leq m \leq |\mathcal{C}|)$ be an enumeration for $\mathcal{C}$. We assume that $\mathcal{C}$ contains at least one constant. We call a function $f : \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C})^{k+l} \to \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C})$ *general safe recursive* if, under a suitable argument separation $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; y_1, \ldots, y_l)$, f can be defined from the initial functions by operating the schemata specified below.

- $O_j^{k,l}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; y_1, \ldots, y_l) = c_j$ if c_j is a constant. **(Constants)**
- $C_j(; x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_j)}) = c_j(x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_j)})$ if $\mathsf{arity}(c_j) \neq 0$. **(Constructors)**
- $I_j^{k,l}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; y_1, \ldots, y_l) = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ y_{j-k} & \text{if } k \leq j \leq k+l \end{cases}$ **(Projections)**
  $(1 \leq j \leq k+l)$.
- $P_{i,0}(\,; c_i) = c_i$ if c_i is a constant.
  $P_{i,j}(\,; c_i(x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_i)})) = x_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq \mathsf{arity}(c_i))$. **(Predecessors)**
- $C(\,; c_j(x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_j)}), y_1, \ldots, y_{|\mathcal{C}|}) = y_j$. **(Conditional)**
- $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; y_1, \ldots, y_l) = h(x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_m} \,; g_1(\boldsymbol{x} \,; \boldsymbol{y}), \ldots, g_n(\boldsymbol{x} \,; \boldsymbol{y}))$
  $(\{j_1, \ldots, j_m\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\})$, **(Safe composition)**
  where h has m normal and n safe argument positions.
- $f(c_j(x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_j)}), \boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z}) = h_j(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z}, f(x_1, \boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z}), \ldots, f(x_{\mathsf{arity}(c_j)}, \boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z}))$
  $(j \in I)$ **(General safe recursion)**
  In case that c_j is a constant, the schema of general safe recursion should be understood as $f(c_j, \boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z}) = h_j(\boldsymbol{y} \,; \boldsymbol{z})$.

Definition 6.1 (Safe recursive graph rewrite systems). We call a GRS $\mathcal{G}$ over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ *safe recursive* if $\mathcal{G}$ consists of an infinite number of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules over $\mathcal{F}$ and of a finite number of graph rewrite rules (G, l, r) fulfilling one of the following conditions 1 and 2.

1. $G \restriction r = (G \restriction l) \restriction v$ for some node $v \in V_{G \restriction l} \setminus \{l\}$.
2. (a) The set V_G of vertices consists of $2+k+l+n$ elements u, v, $x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l}$, $w_1, \ldots, w_n$.
   (b) $l = u$ and $r = v$.
   (c) $\{\mathsf{lab}_G(u), \mathsf{lab}_G(v), \mathsf{lab}_G(w_1), \ldots, \mathsf{lab}_G(w_n)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.
   (d) $\mathsf{lab}_G(x_j)$ is undefined for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k+l\}$.
   (e) $\mathsf{succ}_G(u) = x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}$.
   (f) $\mathsf{succ}_G(v) = x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_m} \,; w_1, \ldots, w_n$ for some $\{j_1, \ldots, j_m\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$.
   (g) $\mathsf{succ}_G(w_j) = x_1, \ldots, x_k \,; x_{k+l}, \ldots, x_{k+l}$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Lemma 6.2. *For every general safe recursive function f over a finite set $\mathcal{C}$ of constructors, there exists a constructor safe recursive GRS defining f.*

Proof. By induction over the definition of f. Since we always assume that constructors only have safe argument positions, we can identify the function $O_j^{0,0}$ with the constant c_j and the function C_j with the constructor c_j. In the base case, **(Constants)** can be defined by a single graph rewrite rule in a special shape of 2 in Definition 6.1, and each of **(Projections)**, **(Predecessors)** and **(Conditional)** can be defined by a single graph rewrite rule in the form of 1 in Definition 6.1. The induction step splits into two cases. In case that f is defined by **(Safe composition)**, f is defined by a graph rewrite rule in the form of 2 in Definition 6.1 together with the constructor safe recursive GRSs obtained from induction hypothesis. In case that f is defined by **(General safe recursion)**, f is defined by an infinite set of constructor safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules together with the constructor safe recursive GRSs obtained from induction hypothesis. □

Example 6.3. Let us discuss a safe recursive GRS expressing the TRS $\mathcal{R}$ on page 2. To obey the formal definition of safe recursive GRSs, instead of considering $\mathcal{R}$ directly, we consider the following TRS over the signature $\mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{C} = \{\epsilon, \mathsf{0}, \mathsf{c}, \mathsf{s}\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}_0, \mathsf{h}_1, \mathsf{g}, \mathsf{f}\}$.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 & \mathsf{i}_j^{2,l}(x, y\,; u_1, u_2) \to u_{j-2} \quad (l = 1, 2,\ j \in \{3, 2+l\}) \\
\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}(\,; x) \to x & \mathsf{h}_0(x, y\,;\, u, v) \to \mathsf{c}(\,; \mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}(x, y\,; u, v), \mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}(x, y\,; u, v)) \\
\mathsf{g}(\epsilon\,; z) \to \mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}(\,; z) & \mathsf{g}(\mathsf{c}(\,; x, y)\,; z) \to \mathsf{h}_0(x, y\,; z, \mathsf{g}(x\,; z), \mathsf{g}(y\,; z)) \\
\mathsf{e}(x\,;) \to \epsilon & \mathsf{h}_1(x, y\,; z) \to \mathsf{g}(y\,; \mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}(x, y\,; z)) \\
\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{0}, y\,;) \to \mathsf{e}(y\,;) & \mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(\,; x), y\,;) \to \mathsf{h}_1(x, y\,; \mathsf{f}(x, y\,;))
\end{array}$$

The rewrite rules defining $\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}$, $\mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}$, $\mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}$ and $\mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}$ can be expressed by graph rewrite rules in the shape of Case 1 in Definition 6.1. For example, the rule $\mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}(x, y\,; z) \to z$ is expressed by the rule (1) below. The defining rule for h_0 can be expressed by the graph rewrite rule (2) which is an instance of Case 2 in Definition 6.1.



Consider the rewrite rules $\mathsf{g}(\epsilon\,; z) \to \mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}(\,; z)$ and $\mathsf{g}(\mathsf{c}(\,; x, y)\,; z) \to \mathsf{h}_0(x, y; z, \mathsf{g}(x\,; z), \mathsf{g}(y\,; z))$. Let $\Sigma_\mathsf{g} = \{\epsilon, \mathsf{c}\}$ and $\Theta_\mathsf{g} = \{\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}, \mathsf{h}_0\}$ be two signatures with the bijection $\epsilon \mapsto \mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}$ and $\mathsf{c} \mapsto \mathsf{h}_0$. Define an argument separation as indicted in the rules above. Then, the rewrite rules defining g can be expressed by the set $\mathcal{G}_\mathsf{g}$ of all the safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules defining g over $\Sigma_\mathsf{g} \cup \Theta_\mathsf{g} \cup \{\mathsf{g}\}$. The rule $\mathsf{e}(x\,;) \to \epsilon$ can be expressed by the graph rewrite rule (3) above which is a special case of Case 2 in Definition 6.1. The defining rule for h_1 can be expressed by a graph rewrite rule as (2). Finally, consider the rewrite rules $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{0}, y\,;) \to \mathsf{e}(y\,;)$ and $\mathsf{f}(\mathsf{s}(\,; x), y\,;) \to \mathsf{h}_1(x, y\,; \mathsf{f}(x, y\,;))$. Let $\Sigma_\mathsf{f} = \{\mathsf{0}, \mathsf{s}\}$ and

$\Theta_{\mathsf{f}} = \{\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}_1\}$ be two signatures with the bijection $\mathsf{0} \mapsto \mathsf{e}$ and $\mathsf{s} \mapsto \mathsf{h}_1$. Define an argument separation as indicted accordingly. Then, the rewrite rules defining f can be expressed by the infinite set of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules defining f over $\Sigma_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \Theta_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \{\mathsf{f}\}$. Now, define a GRS $\mathcal{G}$ by $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$, where $\mathcal{G}_0$ is the finite set of graph rewrite rules defining $\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}$, $\mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}$, $\mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}$, $\mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}$, e, h_0 and h_1 as pictured above. Clearly $\mathcal{G}$ is a constructor safe recursive GRS, and the TRS can be expressed by $\mathcal{G}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor safe recursive GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$ is induced by a redex (R, φ) in a closed term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ for a rule $R = (G', l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : G' \restriction l \to G$. Let $r' \in V_H$ the node corresponding to $r \in V_{G'}$. Then, for the interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ defined for G and H, $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction \varphi(l)) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H \restriction r')$ holds for $\ell = \max(\{|G' \restriction r|\} \cup \{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.7, it suffices to check the case that the rule $R \in \mathcal{G}$ is in the form either 1 or 2 in Definition 6.1. We mention that Lemma 5.2 still holds for a constructor safe recursive GRS $\mathcal{G}$.

Case 1. $H \restriction r' = (G \restriction \varphi(l)) \restriction \varphi(v) = G \restriction \varphi(v)$ for some node $v \in V_{G' \restriction l} \setminus \{l\}$. If $G \restriction \varphi(v) \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$, then $H \restriction r' \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$, and hence $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction \varphi(l)) >_\ell^{\langle 3 \rangle} [\,] = \mathcal{I}(H \restriction r')$. Suppose $G \restriction \varphi(v) \notin \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{C})$. Since $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$, the node $\varphi(v)$ lies on a safe path from root_G. Moreover, as well as $\varphi(l)$, the node r' lies on a safe path from root_H. From these observations, the equality $H \restriction r' = G \restriction \varphi(v)$ and Lemma 4.2.2, one can show that $\mathcal{I}(G \restriction \varphi(l)) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H \restriction r')$ holds by structural induction over $G \restriction \varphi(l)$.

Case 2. Let $V_{G'}$ consists of $2+k+l+n$ elements $u, v, x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l}, w_1, \ldots, w_n$ as specified in Case 2 in Definition 6.1. To make the presentation simpler, let us identify the nodes $u, x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l} \in V_{G' \restriction l}$ with the nodes in V_G corresponding by the homomorphism φ and the nodes $v, w_1, \ldots, w_n\ x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l} \in V_{G' \restriction r}$ with the corresponding nodes in V_H, e.g., $u = \varphi(l)$ and $v = r'$. We write f to denote $\mathsf{lab}_G(u)$, h to denote $\mathsf{lab}_H(v)$ and write g_j to denote $\mathsf{lab}_H(w_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then, by the interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ defined for G and H, the term graphs $G \restriction u$ and $H \restriction v$ are respectively transformed into the following sequences of terms.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(G \restriction u) &= [\, f_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_k))\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction y_1)^\frown \cdots {}^\frown \mathcal{I}(G \restriction y_{l'}),\\
\mathcal{I}(H \restriction v) &= [\, h_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_{j_1}), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_{j_m})\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_1)^\frown \cdots {}^\frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_n),\\
\mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_1) &= [\, (g_1)_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_k))\,]^\frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction y_1)^\frown \cdots {}^\frown \mathcal{I}(H \restriction y_{l'}),\\
\mathcal{I}(H \restriction w_j) &= [\, (g_j)_{\mathsf{n}}(\mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_1), \ldots, \mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_k))\,] \qquad (2 \le j \le n),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\{j_1, \ldots, j_m\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{l'}\} = \{x \in \{x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}\} \mid (u, x) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(G) \restriction u}\} = \{x \in \{x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}\} \mid (w_1, x) \in E_{\mathcal{J}(H) \restriction w_1}\}$, and $y_1 < \cdots < y_{l'}$. Define a precedence $>$ as $f_{\mathsf{n}} > h_{\mathsf{n}}, (g_1)_{\mathsf{n}}, \ldots, (g_n)_{\mathsf{n}}$. Write t_j to denote $\mathsf{term}(G \restriction x_j)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then $\mathsf{term}(H \restriction x_j) = t_j$ holds for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Since $f_{\mathsf{n}} > h_{\mathsf{n}}$ and $f_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \rhd t_{j_m}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, the following orientation holds.

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1, \ldots, t_k) >_\ell^{\langle 1 \rangle} h_{\mathsf{n}}(t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_m}) \tag{10}$$

Similarly, since $f_{\mathsf{n}} > (g_j)_{\mathsf{n}}$ for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and $f_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k) \rhd t_j$ for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$, the following orientations also hold.

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k) >_\ell^{\langle 1\rangle} (g_j)_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k) \quad (j = 1,\ldots,n) \tag{11}$$

Since $1 + n \leq |G' \upharpoonright r| \leq \ell$, the orientations (10) and (11) imply

$$f_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k) >_\ell^{\langle 2\rangle} [\, h_{\mathsf{n}}(t_{j_1},\ldots,t_{j_m})\ (g_1)_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k)\cdots(g_n)_{\mathsf{n}}(t_1,\ldots,t_k)\,].$$

This together with Lemma 4.2.3 allows us to conclude $\mathcal{I}(G \upharpoonright u) >_\ell^{\langle 3\rangle} \mathcal{I}(H \upharpoonright v)$. □

One would observe that Lemma 5.8 also holds for a constructor safe recursive GRS $\mathcal{G}$. Thus, by a slight modification of the proof of Theorem 5.9, using Lemma 6.4 instead of Lemma 5.7, one can deduce the following theorem.

Theorem 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor safe recursive GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}_0$ be the maximal subset of $\mathcal{G}$ that does not contain any unfolding graph rewrite rule. Suppose* $\max(\{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{|G \upharpoonright r| \mid \exists l\ (G,l,r) \in \mathcal{G}_0\}) \leq d$. *For any closed basic term graph $G_0 \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G_0 \to_{\mathcal{G}}^* G$ and $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $\mathcal{I}(G) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H)$ holds for $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\upharpoonright v}| + d$.*

Corollary 6.6. *For every general safe recursive function f over constructors $\mathcal{C}$, there exist a constructor safe recursive GRS $\mathcal{G}$ over a signature $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \mathcal{C}$ defining f and a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^m H$ for some term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, then $m \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}|)$ holds.*

In addition, Lemma 5.11 can be modified as follows.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor safe recursive GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{G}_0$ be the maximal subset of $\mathcal{G}$ that does not contain any unfolding graph rewrite rule, and* $\max\{|G \upharpoonright r| \mid \exists l\ (G,l,r) \in \mathcal{G}_0\} \leq d$. *For any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and for any term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^n H$, then $|V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\upharpoonright v}| \leq n \cdot \Big(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}| + d\Big) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}|$ holds.*

In order to show that a witnessing GRS $\mathcal{G}$ for Theorem 3.3 is polynomially bounded, it is shown that there exists a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\max\{m, |H|\} \leq p(|G|)$ holds whenever $G \stackrel{!}{\to}_{\mathcal{G}}^m H$ holds [8, Propositon 1]. As a consequence of Corollary 6.6 and Lemma 6.7, it can be sharpened as follows.

Corollary 6.8. *For every general safe recursive function f over constructors $\mathcal{C}$, there exist a constructor safe recursive GRS $\mathcal{G}$ over a signature $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \mathcal{C}$ defining f and a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ and for any term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^m H$, then the following two conditions hold.*

1. $m \leq p\Big(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}|\Big)$.

2. $|H| \leq p\left(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|\right) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v_j}|$.

In contrast to Theorem 3.3, the upper bound $p\left(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|\right)$ for m depends only on the size $|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ (of the union) of the subgraphs connected to the normal argument positions. Moreover, innermost rewriting is not assumed as long as rewriting starts with a (closed) basic term graph.

Remark 6.9. The schema (**General Safe Recursion**) is formulated based on safe recursion (on notation) following [7] whereas the schema of general ramified recurrence formulated in [8] is based on ramified recurrence following [10]. Due to the difference between safe recursion and ramified recurrence, the definition of general safe recursive functions on page 16 is slightly different from the original definition of *tiered recursive* functions in [8]. Notably, the schema (**Safe composition**) is a weaker form of the original one in [7], which was introduced in [9]. It is not clear whether there is a precise correspondence between general safe recursive functions in the current formulation and tiered recursive functions. However, it is known that the polytime functions (over binary words) can be covered with the weak form of safe composition, cf. [4, Lemma 12], which means that the restriction of the general safe recursive functions to unary constructors still covers all the polytime functions.

7 Precedence termination with argument separation

In this section, generalising the definition of safe recursive GRSs defined in the previous section, we propose *precedence termination with argument separation*, which is a restriction of the standard precedence termination in the sense of [11]. The restrictive precedence termination together with suitable assumptions yields a new criterion for the polynomial runtime complexity of infinite GRSs and for the polynomial size of normal forms in infinite GRSs (Corollary 7.8).

Definition 7.1. Let $>$ be a precedence over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ and $G, H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ be two term graphs. Then the relation $G >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} H$ holds if $\mathsf{lab}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) > \mathsf{lab}_H(v)$ for any $v \in V_H$ whenever $\mathsf{lab}_H(v)$ is defined, and additionally one of the following two cases holds.

1. $G \restriction v \geqslant_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} H$ for some successor node v of root_G.
2. $\mathsf{lab}_H(\mathsf{root}_H)$ is defined, i.e. $\mathsf{lab}_G(\mathsf{root}_G) > \mathsf{lab}_H(\mathsf{root}_H)$,
   - for each $v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)$, $H \restriction v$ is a sub-term graph of $G \restriction u$ for some $u \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)$, and
   - $G >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} H \restriction v$ for each $v \in \mathsf{safe}(\mathsf{root}_H)$.

We say that a GRS $\mathcal{G}$ over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ is *precedence-terminating with argument separation* if for some separation of argument positions and for some precedence $>$ on $\mathcal{F}$, the following two conditions are fulfilled.

1. For each rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is undefined for any node $v \in \mathsf{safe}(l)$.

2. $G \upharpoonright l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \upharpoonright r$ for each rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ for the relation $>_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}}$ induced by the precedence $>$.

We note that, for any graph rewrite rule (G, l, r), *variable nodes are maximally shared* in the term graph $G \upharpoonright r$, which may not be assumed in a different formulation of graph rewrite systems. In the rest of this section, for every GRS $\mathcal{G}$ we always assume that for each rewrite rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and for any node $v \in V_{G\upharpoonright r}$, if $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is undefined, then $v \in V_{G\upharpoonright l}$. We only consider GRSs over finite signatures. Hence, for any (infinite) constructor GRS $\mathcal{G}$ over a signature $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}$, the defined symbols $\mathcal{D}$ can be partitioned into two sets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{inf}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ so that every symbol $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{inf}}$ is defined by infinite rules whereas every symbol $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}}$ is defined by finite rules.

Recall that Lemma 4.2.3 was employed to show Lemma 5.7. To show a lemma corresponding to Lemma 5.7, Lemma 4.2.3 is slightly generalised.

Lemma 7.2. *If $s >_\ell^{\langle 2\rangle} b$, $b = b_1{}^\frown \cdots {}^\frown b_k$ and $b_j \neq [\,]$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, then $[\,s\,]{}^\frown c >_\ell^{\langle 3\rangle} b_1{}^\frown c_1{}^\frown \cdots {}^\frown b_k{}^\frown c_k$ holds for any sequence $c = c_1{}^\frown \cdots {}^\frown c_k$.*

Lemma 7.3. (Cf. Lemma 5.7) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ that is precedence-terminating with argument separation. Suppose that $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$ is induced by a redex (R, φ) in a closed term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}_{\mathsf{nrm}}(\mathcal{F})$ for a rule $R = (G', l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : G' \upharpoonright l \to G$. Let $r' \in V_H$ the node corresponding to $r \in V_{G'}$. Then, for the interpretations $\mathcal{I}$ defined for G and H, $\mathcal{I}(G \upharpoonright \varphi(l)) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H \upharpoonright r')$ holds for $\ell = \max(\{|G' \upharpoonright r|\} \cup \{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\})$.*

Lemma 7.4. (Cf. Lemma 5.8) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ that is precedence-terminating with argument separation. For any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^* H$, then, for any node $v \in V_H$ on a safe path from root_H, $|\bigcup_{u\in\mathsf{nrm}(v)} V_{H\upharpoonright u}| \leq |\bigcup_{u\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright u}|$ holds.*

Theorem 7.5. (Cf. Theorem 5.9) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ that is precedence-terminating with argument separation and $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G} \mid \mathsf{lab}_G(l) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}}\}$. Suppose the following two conditions.*

1. $\max(\{\mathsf{arity}(f) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{|G \upharpoonright r| \mid \exists l\ (G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}_0\}) \leq d$.
2. $|V_{G\upharpoonright r} \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(r)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}| \leq |G \upharpoonright l|$ *for any rule* $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$.

Then, for any closed basic term graph $G_0 \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G_0 \to_{\mathcal{G}}^* G$ and $G \to_{\mathcal{G}} H$, then $\mathcal{I}(G) >_\ell \mathcal{I}(H)$ holds for $\ell = 2|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_{G_0})} V_{G_0\upharpoonright v}| + d$.

Corollary 7.6. (Cf. Corollary 5.10) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ that is precedence-terminating with argument separation. Then there exists a polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any closed basic term graph $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, if $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^m H$ holds for some term graph $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$, then $m \leq p(|\bigcup_{v\in\mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\upharpoonright v}|)$ holds.*

Lemma 7.7. (Cf. Lemma 5.11) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a constructor GRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ that is precedence-terminating with argument separation and $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{(G, l, r) \in$*

$\mathcal{G} \mid \mathsf{lab}_G(l) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}}\}$. *Suppose the conditions 1 and 2 in Theorem 7.5 hold. For any closed basic term graph* $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ *and for any term graph* $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$*, if* $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{n} H$*, then* $|V_H \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_H)} V_{H\restriction v}| \leq n \cdot \left(|\bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}| + d\right) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$ *holds.*

Corollary 7.8. (Cf. Corollary 5.12) *Suppose that* $\mathcal{G}$ *is an infinite constructor GRS over a signature* $\mathcal{F}$ *precedence-terminating with argument separation that enjoys the condition 2 in Theorem 7.5. Then, for any closed basic term graph* $G \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$ *and for any term graph* $H \in \mathcal{TG}(\mathcal{F})$*, if* $G \to_{\mathcal{G}}^{m} H$*, then the following two conditions hold.*

1. $m \leq p\left(|\bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|\right)$.
2. $|H| \leq p\left(|\bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|\right) + |V_G \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(\mathsf{root}_G)} V_{G\restriction v}|$.

Example 7.9. Let us consider the GRS $\mathcal{G}$ defined in Example 6.3. For the signature $\mathcal{F}$ with the partition $\mathcal{C} = \{\epsilon, \mathsf{0}, \mathsf{c}, \mathsf{s}\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}_0, \mathsf{h}_1, \mathsf{g}, \mathsf{f}\}$, define a precedence $>$ by

$\mathsf{f} > \mathsf{e}$ $\quad \mathsf{e} > \epsilon$ $\quad \mathsf{h}_1 > \mathsf{g}$ $\quad \mathsf{g} > \mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}$ $\quad \mathsf{h}_0 > \mathsf{c}$
$\mathsf{f} > \mathsf{h}_1$ $\quad\quad\quad\quad$ $\mathsf{h}_1 > \mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}$ $\quad \mathsf{g} > \mathsf{h}_0$ $\quad \mathsf{h}_0 > \mathsf{i}_j^{2,2}$ $(j = 3, 4)$

It is easy to see that $>$ is well-founded. It is routine to check that for each rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}$,

- $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is undefined for any node $v \in \mathsf{safe}(l)$, and
- $\mathsf{lab}_G(l) > \mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ for any node $v \in V_{G\restriction r}$ whenever $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is defined.

Let $>_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}}$ the relation induced by the precedence $>$ as defined in Definition 7.1. Recall that $\mathcal{G}$ is defined by $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$, where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}}$ are infinite sets of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules respectively defining g and f, and $\mathcal{G}_0$ is a finite set of the rewrite rules defining the other function symbols. Therefore, the set $\mathcal{D}$ is partitioned into $\mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}} = \{\mathsf{i}_1^{0,1}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_4^{2,2}, \mathsf{i}_3^{2,1}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{h}_0, \mathsf{h}_1\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{inf}} = \{\mathsf{g}, \mathsf{f}\}$. Note that $\mathcal{G}_0$ does not contain any unfolding graph rewrite rule. It follows from the definition of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules that $G \restriction l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \restriction r$ for each $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}}$ (See also Corollary 3.7). Consider a rewrite rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}_0$. It is obvious that $G \restriction l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \restriction r$ holds if $(G, l, r,)$ is an instance of Case 1 in Definition 6.1. Suppose that V_G consists of $2 + k + l + n$ elements u, v, $x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l}$, $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ as specified in Case 2 in Definition 6.1. Let $v \in V_{G\restriction r} = \{v, x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l}, w_1, \ldots, w_n\}$. Consider the case that $\mathsf{lab}_G(v)$ is undefined, i.e., $v \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k+l}\}$. In this case, v is a successor node of l. Namely $G \restriction v = G \restriction u$ for some successor node u of l, and hence $G \restriction l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \restriction v$ holds. Assume that $\mathsf{lab}_G(v) \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $v \in \{v, w_1, \ldots, w_n\}$. Since $\mathsf{succ}_G(w_j) = x_1, \ldots, x_k\,; x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_{k+l}$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, it holds that

$$G \restriction l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \restriction w_j. \quad (j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}) \tag{12}$$

Since $\mathsf{succ}_G(v) = x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_m}\,; w_1, \ldots, w_n$ for some $\{j_1, \ldots, j_m\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}$, it follows from (12) that $G \restriction l >_{\mathsf{pt+nrm}} G \restriction v$ holds. To apply Corollary 7.8, we also have to check that $\mathcal{G}$ enjoys the condition 2 in Theorem 7.5. As a consequence

of the partition $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}} \cup \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{inf}}$ observed above, the finite subset $\mathcal{G}_0$ coincides with the set $\{(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G} \mid \mathsf{lab}_G(l) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathsf{fin}}\}$. In other words, $\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $|V_{G\restriction r} \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathsf{nrm}(r)} V_{G\restriction v}| \leq |G \restriction l|$ for any rule $(G, l, r) \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{g}} \cup \mathcal{G}_{\mathsf{f}}$, but it follows from the definition of safe recursive unfolding graph rewrite rules. Therefore, the runtime complexity and the sizes of normal forms in $\mathcal{G}$ can be polynomially bounded as in Corollary 7.8.

8 Conclusion

In this paper we introduced a termination order over sequences of terms together with an interpretation of term graphs into sequences of terms. Unfolding graph rewrite rules which express the equation of (**General Safe Recursion**) can be successfully embedded into the termination order by the interpretation, sharpening the result obtained in [8] about the runtime complexity of those unfolding graph rewrite rules. The introduction of the termination order is strongly motivated by former works [1,5,2,3] and also based on an observation that every unfolding graph rewrite rule is precedence terminating in the sense defined in [11]. Generalising the definition of unfolding graph rewrite rules for general safe recursion, we proposed a restrictive notion of the standard precedence termination, precedence termination with argument separation. The restrictive precedence termination together with suitable assumptions yields a new criterion for the polynomial runtime complexity of infinite GRSs and for the polynomial size of normal forms in infinite GRSs.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Kazushige Terui for drawing his attention to the work [8], which was the initial point of the current research.

References

1. T. Arai and G. Moser. Proofs of Termination of Rewrite Systems for Polytime Functions. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2005)*, volume 3821 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 529–540, 2005.
2. M. Avanzini, N. Eguchi, and G. Moser. A Path Order for Rewrite Systems that Compute Exponential Time Functions. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (RTA 2011)*, volume 10 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 123–138, 2011.
3. M. Avanzini, N. Eguchi, and G. Moser. A New Order-theoretic Characterisation of the Polytime Computable Functions. In *Proceedings of the 10th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems (APLAS 2012)*, volume 7705 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 280–295, 2012.
4. M. Avanzini, N. Eguchi, and G. Moser. A New Order-theoretic Characterisation of the Polytime Computable Functions (Technical report). CoRR: cs/CC/1201.2533. Available online at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.2553`, 2012.

5. M. Avanzini and G. Moser. Complexity Analysis by Rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Functional and Logic Programming (FLOPS 2008)*, volume 4989 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 130–146, 2008.
6. H. P. Barendregt, M. C. J. D. van Eekelen, J. R. W. Glauert, R. Kennaway, M. J. Plasmeijer, and M. R. Sleep. Term graph rewriting. In *Parallel Architectures and Languages Europe, Volume II*, volume 259, pages 141–158, 1987.
7. S. Bellantoni and S. A. Cook. A New Recursion-theoretic Characterization of the Polytime Functions. *Computational Complexity*, 2(2):97–110, 1992.
8. U. Dal Lago, S. Martini, and M. Zorzi. General Ramified Recurrence is Sound for Polynomial Time. In P. Baillot, editor, *Proceedings International Workshop on Developments in Implicit Computational Complexity (DICE 2010)*, pages 47–62, 2010.
9. W. G. Handley and S. S. Wainer. Complexity of Primitive Recursion. In U. Berger and H. Schwichtenberg, editors, *Computational Logic*, volume 165 of *NATO ASI Series F: Computer and Systems Science*, pages 273–300. Springer, 1999.
10. D. Leivant. Ramified Recurrence and Computational Complexity I: Word Recurrence and Poly-time. In P. Clote and J. B. Remmel, editors, *Feasible Mathematics II, Progress in Computer Science and Applied Logic*, volume 13, pages 320–343. Birkhäuser Boston, 1995.
11. A. Middeldorp, H. Ohsaki, and H. Zantema. Transforming Termination by Self-Labeling. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automated Deduction (CADE 1996)*, pages 373–387, 1996.